



Technical Task Force Minutes

Tuesday, August 26, 2008

1:00 – 3:00 pm

Lake DOT

600 W. Winchester Rd.

Libertyville, IL 60048

1.0 Roll Call

- Buehler, Marty, Chair (Lake County DOT)
- Heinz, Bill (Village of Grayslake)
- Harmet, Peter (IDOT)
- Huber, Marc (Village of Round Lake)
- Quick, Dan (Village of Wauconda)
- Richartz, Cindy (Abbott Laboratories)
- Ziegler, David (Village of Gurnee)

Staff:

- Patty Gayes (Lake County Partners)
- Chuck Gleason (LCDOT – Project Manager)

Consultants:

- Jeff Hall, (TranSystems)
- Matt Smith (TranSystems)

2.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

3.0 August 26, 2008 Meeting Minutes Approval

- Motion:** To approve 8/26/2008 Minutes
- Motion By:** Marc Huber
- Seconded By:** Dan Quick
- Discussion:** No discussion.
- Motion Passed:** Unanimous

4.0 Chairman's Remarks

4.1 Project update

The items to be addressed by the Technical Task Force at this meeting included:

- a) a recommendation by the TTF regarding the western terminus alternatives, so that the Governance Board will have this input at its 9/17/08 meeting.
- b) Review the Statement of Purpose and Need.
- c) Discuss road character types in relation to the Statement of Purpose and Need.

4.2 Western Terminus Placement Alternative Analysis

Jeff Hall led a discussion of the western terminus alternatives (1W, 2W, 3W, 4W, and 5W).

- a) 1W represents the original Phase 1 alternative.
- b) 2W ties in to Route 120 as far east as possible – between Bacon and Fairfield Road.
- c) 3W approximates the original study proposal, tying in to Route 120 just before Wilson Road. At the last meeting, the Technical Task Force suggested discontinuing this alternative, because of the lack of developable space. The Environmental Task Force wanted to see all of the alternatives, so this is still on the table.
- d) 4W – ties in to Route 120 as far west as possible, dipping south and joining 120 between Wilson Road and Fish Lake Road. This alternative goes into the Forest Preserve's property. The Environmental Task Force

recommended changing the terminus so that it does not go into Forest Preserve land.

- e) 5W – actually goes outside the corridor study area, cutting south just past Bacon Road as far south as Route 60 and then joining Route 120 between Fish Lake and Gilmer Road. The Technical Task Force had said at its last meeting that we do not have information about traffic impacts, since this is outside the study area. The TTF recommendation was to drop this alternative, rather than spending the time to do further study. The Environmental Task Force recommended keeping the alternative and getting the further information needed, so this is still on the table.

TranSystems studied the alternative western termini in relation to the decision matrix characteristics, to show the strength of each criterion with each alternative. Criteria 1, 2, and 3 are more measurable criteria, while 4 – 8 are more subjective in nature.

In terms of cost, 5W would be the most expensive, with 2W, 3W and 4W about the same cost. 5W would also be highest for most acreage for right-of-way purchase, again with 2W, 3W, and 4W tied. In terms of number of building impacts on the right-of-way properties, 2W and 3W have the most structures on the properties (6), with 4W having 5 properties and 5W having 4.

In terms of environmental impact, alternatives 2W and 3W are the stronger alternatives.

In terms of traffic delay (mean delay), safety, and connectivity, the 2W alternative ranked worst, and the 4W ranked best. Pete Harnet noted that in terms of safety, 2W would be very hard to design, because of the sharp curve at high speed with the potential of a traffic backup.

Pete also asked about alternative 4W's dip through Forest Preserve property. He asked if the property directly above the Forest Preserve was open. Dan Quick noted that Lake County Forest Preserve has often interfered with economic development, and this is another case of that. He said that the 7.1 acres at issue has only been owned by the Forest Preserve for a year or less. Pete said that the federal policy would be to look for alternatives. Marty Buehler suggested we return to this issue later.

Looking at Economic Development on the decision matrix, 5W interferes with Route 60 current usage, and also takes traffic away from proposed land uses; so this is not considered a high scorer. Jeff said that 4W would be the best in this case, because the more developable land available, the better (more rewarding) the alternative. Although 4W scores low with the current land use, because a home is on the property, in terms of proposed use it scores very strongly.

In terms of Enhancement Opportunities, 5W would be strongest, because of natural areas.

As mentioned above, the Technical Task Force previously had dropped 5W and 3W because of the above issues impacting the technical feasibility of building the road. Although the Environmental Task Force wanted all of the alternatives left in place for the Governance Board to decide, Marty said that from the technical standpoint, this is the recommendation of the Technical Task Force.

Motion: To approve TTF recommendation to eliminate Western Terminus Alternatives 5W and 3W from consideration by the Governance Board, and to recommend 4W as the best alternative, with the caveat that the Forest Preserve must agree to cooperate with the Route 120 CPC, whether by moving the Bypass north of the forest preserve or having the Forest Preserve agree to allow the road.

Motion By: Marc Huber
Seconded By: Dan Quick
Discussion: No discussion.

Motion Passed: Unanimous

4.3 Purpose and Need Findings

For the six road character types, the Technical Task Force needs to make sure they each meet the purpose and need statement.

- a) System Linkage and Continuity
 - a. Linkage – east and west termini and their relationship with North/South routes.
 - b. Continuity – Road with the same character throughout.
- b) Capacity to meet the travel demand in the corridor not necessarily 100% of it, but a reasonable percentage.
- c) Level of service – an acceptable level of delay for vehicles entering each intersection.
- d) Safety – addressing a variety of safety issues, including specific high accident locations and at-grade railroad crossings.
- e) Land use and transportation – the region needs to be planned carefully, rather than allowing vying alternatives. Considerations should include driveway consolidations, alternate modes of transportation, natural areas, buffers, and quality of life issues.

Pete said that we could recommend that #1 (no-build) alternative be dropped off, because it clearly does not meet the Purpose and Need Statement, noting that it remains available for comparison purposes to the build alternatives. He also said that #2 could be dropped, since several criteria do not meet the P&N Statement. Marty said that the Purpose and Need comparison chart needed to have more information about what each individual item means.

Motion: To authorize the Consultant to present the Purpose and Need Comparison Chart to the Governance Board with more detailed information, and to approve the TTF recommendation that the #1 (no build) and #2 road character alternates should be eliminated, leaving #3A, #3B, #4, and #5.

Motion By: Pete Harmet
Seconded By: Dave Ziegler
Discussion: No discussion.
Motion Passed: Unanimous

4.4 Road Character Alternatives

Jeff Hall explained and showed a typical section of each Road Character. All of the alternatives have bike paths, all have a median in the middle and ditches on the sides. Alternate 2 has a 150' right of way; the others all have a 300' right of way. Alternate 3A has a suburban look with 4 lanes and roundabouts, a 30' median and 87' of natural area. Alternate 3B, the rural look, has 4 lanes with signals, a 38' median, and a 77' natural area on each side. Alternate #4 has 6 lanes with signals, a 36' median and 58' of open space and natural area on each side. Alternate #5 has 6 lanes and is an expressway with access by ramps. Median is 36', and open space/natural area is 58'. At this point, TTF is only looking at these alternatives for information purposes.

4.5 Schedule

Chuck Gleason presented a revised and detailed schedule for the Governance Board decisions upcoming. At the September 17 meeting, the Board would decide on elimination of any alternatives based on compatibility with the Purpose and Need Statement. At the Governance Board meeting scheduled for December 10, the Board would select its preferred road character. At the March 11 Board meeting, the Board would make a preferred road placement selection.

5.0 Old Business

There was no old business.

6.0 New Business

There was no new business.

7.0 Public Comment

There were no public comments.

8.0 Adjourn

Motion: To adjourn.

Motion By: David Ziegler

Seconded By: Marc Huber

Discussion: The next Technical Task Force meeting was scheduled for 9/23/08.
(Note – that was the meeting date set at the 8/26 meeting. However, in the interim, a new date was established, which is 9/29/08).

Motion Passed: Unanimous.